

Serial No. 10/681,983  
October 24, 2005  
Reply to the Office Action dated July 27, 2005  
Page 4 of 6

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 11-16 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants amend claim 11.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 12 and 15 are allowed, and that claims 13 and 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Joshi (U.S. 6,627,991). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joshi in view of Takekawa et al. (U.S. 4,714,952). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 11 and 16.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite:

"An integrated circuit package comprising:  
a first leadframe;  
**a second leadframe laminated to a portion of a side of said first leadframe thereby providing a multi-layer laminated leadframe;**  
**a semiconductor die mounted to another portion of said side of said first leadframe;** and  
a plurality of contact balls mounted on said semiconductor die."  
(emphasis added)

The Examiner alleged that Joshi teaches all of the features recited in Applicants' claim 11, including a first leadframe 104, a second leadframe 100 laminated to a portion of the first lead frame 104 in order to create a multilayer leadframe, and a semiconductor 400 mounted to another portion of the first leadframe 104.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite the features of "a second leadframe laminated to a portion of a side of said first leadframe thereby providing a multi-layer laminated leadframe" and "a semiconductor die mounted to another portion of said side of said first leadframe."

In contrast to Applicants' claim 11, Joshi teaches a leadframe 104, which the Examiner alleged corresponds to the first lead frame recited in Applicants' claim 11, a base frame 100, which the Examiner alleged corresponds to the second leadframe

Serial No. 10/681,983  
October 24, 2005  
Reply to the Office Action dated July 27, 2005  
Page 5 of 6

recited in Applicants' claim 11, that is disposed on one side of the leadframe 104, and a silicon die 400, which the Examiner alleged corresponds to the semiconductor die recited in Applicants' claim 11, that is disposed on the opposite side of the leadframe 104 (see, for example, Figs. 5 and 6 of Joshi). Thus, Joshi clearly fails to teach or suggest a second leadframe and a semiconductor die that are disposed on the same side of the leadframe 104.

Therefore, Joshi certainly fails to teach or suggest the features of "a second leadframe laminated to a portion of a side of said first leadframe thereby providing a multi-layer laminated leadframe" and "a semiconductor die mounted to another portion of said side of said first leadframe" (emphasis added) as recited in Applicants' claim 11.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Joshi.

Takekawa et al. was relied upon to allegedly cure deficiencies of Joshi. However, Takekawa et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the feature of "a second leadframe laminated to a portion of a side of said first leadframe thereby providing a multi-layer laminated leadframe" and "a semiconductor die mounted to another portion of said side of said first leadframe" as recited in Applicants' claim 11.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Joshi and Takekawa et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Applicants' claim 11.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 11 is allowable. Claims 13, 14 and 16 depend upon claim 11, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 11 is allowable. Claims 12 and 15 have been allowed by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

Serial No. 10/681,983  
October 24, 2005  
Reply to the Office Action dated July 27, 2005  
Page 6 of 6

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 24, 2005

  
Attorneys for Applicants

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710

**KEATING & BENNETT LLP**  
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850  
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102  
Telephone: (703) 637-1480  
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499